

**DISCLAIMER**

*This electronic version of an SCC order is for informational purposes only and is not an official document of the Commission. An official copy may be obtained from the [Clerk of the Commission, Document Control Center](#).*

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

AT RICHMOND, FEBRUARY 23, 2001

APPLICATION OF

VERIZON VIRGINIA INC. f/k/a  
BELL ATLANTIC - VIRGINIA, INC.

CASE NO. PUC990101

For approval of its Network  
Services Interconnection Tariff,  
S.C.C.-Va.-No. 218

ORDER

Verizon Virginia Inc. ("Verizon Virginia" or "the Company") f/k/a Bell Atlantic - Virginia, Inc., filed a collocation services tariff on May 29, 1999, which was approved by the State Corporation Commission ("Commission") on an interim basis on June 25, 1999, and further approved on an interim basis after revisions filed September 17, 1999, May 17, 2000, and November 21, 2000.

On December 20, 2000, the Commission entered an Order providing for further comment by February 2, 2001, on the latest revision filed November 21, 2000, and directing Verizon Virginia to file with the Commission the settlement agreement referenced in the Company's November 3, 2000, letter.

Also on December 20, 2000, Verizon Virginia filed a Joint Petition for Approval of Settlement Agreement Addressing Collocation Rates, Terms and Conditions ("Settlement Agreement")

on behalf of itself, AT&T Communications of Virginia, Inc., WorldCom, Inc., and Sprint Communications Company of Virginia, Inc. Verizon Virginia states that the parties to the Settlement Agreement were able to resolve all the collocation rate elements at issue in this proceeding, as well as many non-price terms and conditions. The parties to the Settlement Agreement proposed that the agreed upon rates, terms and conditions be adopted and incorporated into Verizon Virginia's collocation tariff. In addition, these parties request the initiation of a limited proceeding to address the remaining unresolved issues. However, the Commission recognizes that not all parties to this proceeding are participants in the Settlement Agreement.

Therefore, upon consideration of the foregoing and because of the complexity of the issues in this case, the Commission is of the opinion that other interested parties should have an opportunity to comment on the Settlement Agreement and provide any suggestions on how to proceed with both the Settlement Agreement and the remaining issues in this case. Such parties are requested to file comments on or before March 27, 2001, that, at a minimum, address the following questions:

- (1) How should the Commission proceed with this case, given that not all parties to this case have agreed on the terms of the Settlement Agreement?
  - (a) Should the Commission hold either an evidentiary hearing and/or oral argument on this Settlement Agreement wherein all parties may have an

opportunity to express their views on the Settlement Agreement?

- (b) Should the Commission consider adopting the Settlement Agreement only for the parties to the Agreement and require these parties to incorporate such in their interconnection agreements instead of modifying an intrastate tariff that is applicable to all carriers?
- (2) Should all the parties in this case be required to attempt to reach settlement before the Commission proceeds further?
- (3) Can the Commission adopt provisions of the proposed Settlement Agreement, which may also be applicable to parties not included therein, given that some of these provisions may conflict with its earlier Orders in this case, i.e., that the interim rates are subject to refund?
- (4) If the Commission approves the terms of the Settlement Agreement, how should it identify and proceed on all unresolved issues pertinent to all parties in this case, not just those issues identified by the Settlement Agreement participants?
  - (a) Should all the parties be required to file a list either jointly or independently regarding the remaining outstanding issues?
  - (b) Should the Commission request new comments on all the identified outstanding issues and provide for an opportunity for hearing on these issues?
- (5) Does the Commission need to determine that the proposed Settlement Agreement meets the requirements of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and/or all FCC rules and requirements related to collocation before it can be approved either as a negotiated settlement between the parties or as revisions to an intrastate tariff under this Commission's jurisdiction?
- (6) If the Commission does not approve this Settlement Agreement, how should it identify and proceed with all the outstanding issues in this case?

- (7) If the Settlement Agreement is not adopted by the Commission, should Verizon Virginia be required to submit new cost studies reflecting only Virginia-specific costs as recommended by the Staff in its report in this case, filed on October 27, 1999?

We intend to proceed expeditiously toward resolution of these collocation issues and hope that the comments received from interested parties will assist us in reaching that goal. In the interim, we encourage Verizon Virginia to work with the carriers not included in the Settlement Agreement to try to resolve the remaining issues between them.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) On or before March 27, 2001, interested parties may file comments with the Commission on the Settlement Agreement.

- (2) On or before April 17, 2001, Verizon Virginia and the other parties to the Settlement Agreement may file comments on the questions raised herein and reply to any comments filed by interested parties.

- (3) This matter is continued generally.